

Army in central Africa and Boko Haram in Nigeria.

Unsurprisingly, these terrorists have also taken advantage of the instability and corruption in African governments. Terrorists sell their bounties under the radar in the illicit market. The penalties for those caught poaching are minimal.

So for terrorists who are looking to avoid detection, make a lot of money, and not face consequences if caught, poaching is their grand bargain.

So what is being done? Our intelligence community has yet to establish a clear understanding of which terrorist groups are the most involved in poaching and who facilitates the worldwide transactions from Africa to other countries.

We need wildlife trackers to track the money trail and the destruction of these creatures. The administration needs to have a plan to stop this eradication of mammoth animals.

Multiple agencies from the State Department, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, and others have been involved in efforts to eradicate poaching, but it appears no agency has taken the lead. Talk must turn to action.

Last February, the Presidential Task Force on Wildlife Trafficking issued a national strategy for combating wildlife trafficking, but there is no implementation plan. Nine months later, we are still waiting for a strategy to go into effect.

Meanwhile, endangered species are being slaughtered, like Satao, and terrorists are being paid from the sales of endangered species' tusks and horns.

Preserving endangered species is a noble goal, but the fact that killers worldwide are using this money to fund terrorism makes it even more urgent we stop this ruthless criminal conduct.

These terrorists kill animals, so they can get money to kill people. The combination of these two evils, the killing of endangered species and innocent civilians to further radical terrorism, is an international threat.

The world cannot allow radical Islamic terrorists to continue the wholesale slaughter of rhinos and elephants to fund their reign of terror. Make terrorists extinct, not these animals. Otherwise, the only rhinos and elephants our grandkids are going to see are the stuffed animals at Toys "R" Us.

And that is just the way it is.

NATIONAL CARE CORPS ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from New Mexico (Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM) for 5 minutes.

Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico. Madam Speaker, I rise during National Family Caregivers Month to recognize the millions of family caregivers who do incredible work every day and to talk about the future of caregiving in this country.

Right now, the vast majority of care services in the United States are pro-

vided by family caregivers. They do this out of love for their loved ones, to restore and maintain respect and dignity, and because the vast majority of disabled adults and seniors rely on Medicare as their primary insurance, and Medicare does not pay for long-term care services, and they are barely ineligible for Medicaid, which might.

Forty-nine million Americans provide more than 520 billion in care to seniors and adults with disabilities every year. They manage a range of really difficult responsibilities because they have a friend or a loved one who is older or who has a disability and is in need of extra help.

I know how tough it is to be a family caregiver because I am one. My mother, who lives with me in New Mexico, relies on me to oversee her care and also provide financial support. These are difficult arrangements for a number of reasons. Having a parent rely on a child when they have spent their life being the caregiver can be a tough transition to make.

But family caregivers navigate that relationship while taking the time to call insurance companies and hospitals to ensure their loved one is getting proper care and while often having to use their own resources to cover many of the costs associated with that care.

They do it out of love, and they do it because they know that their mother or their husband or their friend wants to remain as independent as possible, and they know that they want to live out their lives with dignity. I think they have earned that right.

But these family caregivers cannot do it alone. They need someone to take their sister to her appointment and when they get busy with a day at work or to make sure that their dad takes his medication while they attend a parent-teacher conference.

Already in this country, we have got more than 4 million men and women who have chosen direct care as a career and provide these kind of services on a paid basis, but if you look at the sheer demographics, that is not nearly enough.

As the baby boom generation continues to age, demand for services will increase. The gap between the number of family caregivers and direct care workers and the number of people who need services will continue to grow.

In 2010, there were seven potential caregivers for every person over the age of 80. By 2030, that ratio is projected to drop by almost half, to 4.1.

In the direct care workforce, demand is projected to grow, so that the U.S. will need to add at least 1 million more direct care workers over the next 10 years.

So we face real challenges in growing a workforce that will help meet the needs of our population. At the same time, our economy continues to slowly recover from the Great Recession.

Young people looking to enter the workforce, along with workers who are willing to retrain, want to find jobs in

a field that is growing and can provide them with some job security.

So I see two challenges that I think can be solved with one coordinated national effort called Care Corps. My bill, H.R. 5288, creates a national Care Corps that will place volunteers and communities to work with seniors and individuals with disabilities who need a little extra support to live independently.

In return for their services, volunteers will receive health insurance and other benefits, along with a postservice educational award. This award can be used to pay for up to 2 years of attendance at an institution of higher education or to pay back educational loans.

But I want to end with what I think will be the program's legacy if we are able to get this done. Care Corps provides an opportunity for intergenerational relationships, for seniors and our young people to learn from each other, and for us as a country to gain a better sense of our history to the people that lived it.

Anyone who has ever been a caregiver will tell you not just that it was challenging, but that it was incredibly rewarding.

So I want to thank our family caregivers who are already filling a serious void in this country, and I want to urge my colleagues to support them by supporting the National Care Corps Act.

RECOGNIZING LETTER CARRIER MARGARET HUTCHENS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. POE of Texas). The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from North Carolina (Ms. FOXX) for 5 minutes.

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, today, I rise to recognize Yadkinville Letter Carrier Margaret Hutchens, who delivers mail in the Country Club Road area, the Booneville end of U.S. 601, and the Hamptonville side of Old U.S. 421 West, upon her induction into the prestigious Million Mile Club.

Margaret received this high honor from the National Safety Council in recognition of having driven in the workplace for at least 30 years or 1 million miles without incurring a preventable motor vehicle accident.

Let's think about the magnitude of travelling 1 million miles. That would be two trips to the moon and back.

At the celebration honoring her accomplishment, Margaret thanked the customers on her route and said she knew God was looking out for her during those 30 years of accident-free driving.

This honor illustrates the dedication to excellence that Margaret practices every day, and her customers are fortunate to have such a reliable and hard-working letter carrier.

□ 1215

WATERS OF THE UNITED STATES RULE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from

Pennsylvania (Mr. THOMPSON) for 5 minutes.

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, Friday, November 14, was the closing of the public comment period for the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency and the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers' proposed "waters of the United States"—WOTUS, as it is known—rule under the Clean Water Act, which would dramatically expand the scope of Federal authority over water and land uses across the United States.

Enacted in 1972, the Clean Water Act was created as a partnership between the States and the Federal EPA in order to better manage identified pollution sources through a range of pollution control programs.

This new proposed rule is a direct threat to this longstanding federalist approach created by the law, which has been long supported by Republicans and Democrats alike for over four decades.

It is through this federalist model, which enables regulators at the Federal, State, and local levels to provide adequate flexibility to address water quality while accounting for local and regional variations and conditions, that Pennsylvania has demonstrated a track record of success in improving and protecting the ecological health of its waters. Unfortunately, the proposed rule would dramatically expand the Federal authority to the detriment of our economy and at the expense of existing State-Federal partnerships that have been effective in protecting and improving the biological integrity of our watersheds and waterways.

For this reason, I along with Senator PAT TOOMEY and eight additional members of the Pennsylvania delegation in the U.S. House of Representatives voiced our strong opposition to this flawed policy. In comments submitted Friday to the agencies, we outlined concerns specific to our home State and those of our constituents, including private landowners, counties, municipalities, farmers, foresters, among so many who will be negatively impacted if this rule is allowed to be fully implemented.

Mr. Speaker, there is a widespread agreement that the Clean Water Act has been a beneficial tool for the management and the health of our Nation's watersheds and water quality.

While Congressional intent of the Clean Water Act has been limited to "navigable waters," the extent of the law's jurisdiction has been the subject of much litigation and regulatory action. Complicating the issue further are Supreme Court decisions that have not adequately described the scope of Federal authority under the law resulting, at times, in conflict.

While the existing law and the Supreme Court have left uncertainty regarding what constitutes a "water of the United States," previous holdings have made clear that the Federal Government's authority is not limitless.

Unfortunately, the proposed rule assumes just that—limitless Federal authority.

Mr. Speaker, the reason this is so concerning is that many of these issues are best regulated at the State level in a manner that recognizes regional differences in geography, climate, geology, soils, hydrology, and rainfall, among other variables. Rather than strengthen the law, the rule creates more confusion—confusion that will most certainly delay permitting and will undermine strong water quality programs that exist in Pennsylvania and in other States. Moreover, this type of uncertainty is susceptible to inconsistent interpretation and application, which holds the potential for substantial implementation costs across the various Clean Water Act programs, and will likely invite more enforcement actions and third-party litigation.

In addition to jeopardizing existing water quality control programs, the economic impact of the proposed rule will be far-reaching. Activities that drive economic development in Pennsylvania, such as highway and road construction, pipeline projects, energy production, infrastructure projects, farming, flood control, and public works projects will all be subject to Federal permitting if this proposal is finalized.

For example, the rule would make most ditches into tributaries. Routine maintenance activities in ditches and on-site ponds and impoundments could trigger permits that can cost \$100,000 or more. These permitting requirements would likely trigger additional environmental reviews which would add years to the completion time for ordinary projects, which means more costs for landowners and more regulatory burdens upon the States, all with no guarantee or measurable benefits to our waters.

Mr. Speaker, we all agree that managing the Nation's water is critically important, but in this case, the Federal Government has failed to recognize the fundamental role that States play in meeting our shared goals of clean watersheds and water resources. Mr. Speaker, it is time for EPA and the Corps to vacate this proposal, get back to the drawing board, and fix the fundamental flaws within this rule. The American people, including my constituents in Pennsylvania, deserve as much.

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12(a) of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess until 2 p.m. today.

Accordingly (at 12 o'clock and 20 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 1400

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. JOLLY) at 2 p.m.

PRAYER

The Chaplain, the Reverend Patrick J. Conroy, offered the following prayer: Dear God, we give You thanks for giving us another day.

We ask Your special blessing upon the Members of this people's House. They face difficult decisions in difficult times with many forces and interests demanding their attention.

We are grateful, O God, that You have given to them the goals of justice and the designs of freedom. Remind each Member that it is their work to develop the strategies and plans of achieving those goals and designs being mindful of the prompting of Your spirit.

You have given to each of them and to us all the abilities to do good works, so we pray that we will be faithful in our tasks, responsible in our actions, and fervent in our desire to serve.

Bless us all, O God, this day and every day to come. And may all that is done be for Your greater honor and glory.

Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair has examined the Journal of the last day's proceedings and announces to the House his approval thereof.

Pursuant to clause 1, rule I, the Journal stands approved.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Will the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. WILSON) come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Mr. WILSON of North Carolina led the Pledge of Allegiance as follows:

I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

HONORING RICHARD FISHER

(Mr. BURGESS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the work of Richard Fisher, who will be retiring as the president of the Federal Reserve Bank of Dallas this coming spring.

President Fisher's work at the institution for the past 10 years has served our area well. Richard has been a fearless advocate for the low regulation of the Texas economy. Because of his stance, north Texas has experienced tremendous economic growth and vitality during the time of his presidency.